SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

17th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XVII, Number 17 P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015 November 1, 1987

Arizona Shells out $290,000

Lobbyists the Big Winners in Super Collider Race

Many spinoffs have been promised by the promoters of the $4.4-billion Superconducting Super Collider (SSC), but the only one so far is a bonanza for Washington public-relations firms, which have taken on a number of competing states at the capital city's traditionally plump rates for PR representation. These firms regularly solicit the attention of the press. SGR Editor Greenberg finally yielded with a visit on October 23 to the downtown Washington office of Hartz/Meek International, which represents Arizona's quest for the project.

Present, as the SGR tape recorder visibly whirred and blinked on the table, were Peter A. Carruthers, Head of the Department of Physics, University of Arizona, and Richard J. Jacob, Chairman of the Department of Physics, Arizona State University. They are Chairman and Vice Chairman, respectively, of the Technical Committee of the Arizona SSC Project. Stepping in later in the meeting was Arizona's SSC lobbyist, John Martin Meek, President of Hartz/Meek International. Following are excerpts, transcribed and edited by SGR.

•

***Q.** Why do you have a public relations firm representing you in Washington?*

Carruthers. First of all, that's for self-protection, because everyone else does. But they're very useful and important in the overall effort. Our lobbyists meet with other state lobbyists regularly to talk about how the project is doing in Congress. And they meet with the Congressional aides all the time.

***Q.** Have you teamed up with other state delegations?*

Jacobs. We have 13 states that we work with closely.

Budget Delays Hit R&D—Page 4
Agriculture Institute Proposed—Page 8

Our main job is to work with the appropriations committees, to provide information. In the second stage [of the SSC selection process], we'll say, "Put it in the West, because it's the best investment. Don't put it in the rust belt, put it in a part of the country that is enthusiastic and growing." After the short list comes out, then, of course, these Western states are going to group themselves into sub-coalitions. We expect Colorado is going to be on the short list, along with us. And so then, of course, Colorado and Arizona will be fighting for the support of the rest of the states. But at the moment, we have a fairly statesmanlike approach.

Carruthers. [jokingly] It's the Peter Principle: we don't doublecross each other until the last minute.

***Q.** You are paying through the nose for this lobbying. Twenty thousand a month is the minimum going rate.*

Carruthers. I don't know how much you know about this situation. Turn that thing off [pointing to the SGR tape recorder].

***Q.** No, we'll keep that thing on. We've discussed that already. What's the bill on this?*

Carruthers. The overall firm has been retained at $290,000 for Phase I [of the SSC selection process].

Jacob. Which takes us up to the announcement of the BQL [best-qualified list, due in January 1988 from a selection committee appointed by the National Academy of Sciences].

(Continued on page 2)

In Brief

The federal regulatory framework for biotechnology is about to undergo a change as the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy moves to grab control of authority now assigned to the Biotechnology Sciences Coordinating Committee (BSSC), a multi-agency body created two years ago. Heading the power play is OSTP's Assistant Director for Life Sciences, Beverly J. Berger, formerly of the Lawrence Livermore Laboratory.

Berger is an appointee of OSTP Director William R. Graham. Poorly regarded on the outside, Graham has cultivated good relations with the political side of the White House. Ralph Bledsoe, Executive Director of the Domestic Policy Council, is lavish in his praise of Graham, and is supporting an expanded biotechnology role for OSTP.

Meanwhile, BSSC Chairman David Kingsbury, who is also NSF's chief for Biological, Behavioral, and Social Sciences, is under Justice Department investigation following anonymously circulated reports that he's retained improper connections to the biotech industry. Kingsbury denies it. NSF has officially stated that, following its own inquiry, it concluded that "no immediate administrative action would be appropriate."

"Bright Investment Bankers who majored in science and went to Wall St. The party's over," declared a small ad in the Sunday, October 25 New York Times *business section. What should they do? Answer: "Consider a PhD in engineering and public policy" at Carnegie-Mellon University. One response was reported by Tuesday morning.*

. . . Keeping in Close Touch with Washington Events

(Continued from page 1)

***Q.** \$290,000 for six months?*

Carruthers. Right.

Jacob. They [the lobbying firm] have produced materials which make it easier for us to raise a lot of the money that we need still back in the state.

***Q.** The \$290,000, is that state money or private money?*

Jacob. Both. The state has put up \$1.5 million. If you're going to do an exact dollar chase you'd find that most of these dollars come out of the local government and private sector funds that have been contributed as a match.

***Q.** Public money is paying for this lobbying?*

Jacob. But a lot of the contributions are private.

***Q.** What are you getting for this? A brochure?*

Carruthers. We have a video tape which you can see, which helps us raise funds in the state to complete the technical work for Phase II of the project.

***Q.** Your 18-minute videotape?*

Jacob. I think it's probably paid for itself several times over. When things begin to come to a head and all the preparation work that's going on now begins to have an effect after the announcement of the BQL, then we'll be able to point to where the money is going and be glad that it was spent.

Another Bill Due Next Year

***Q.** But then you'll get another bill. The \$290,000 will be up and the meter will have to be fed again.*

Jacob. Sure, but that's to prepare a lot of stuff that needs to be done.

Carruthers. I'll give you an example. Last week, when the Roe-Lujan Amendment [sponsored by Rep. Robert A. Roe (D-NJ) and Manuel Lujan Jr. (R-NM), authorizing construction of the SSC] was getting a day's treatment, one of our lawyers in the lobbying firm spent the day over there. He kept in phone contact with us, "faxed" us the draft of the bill, which we could interact with instantly. So, there's real-time intelligence, in taking action, either in regard to the project as a whole or to our own particular interest.

Jacob. We could actually get draft-revision suggestions immediately back up to the Hill.

***Q.** You can watch what's going on on the floor on C-Span for next to nothing.*

Jacob. You can sit there and see passively what's going on but that's not what we're talking about. We're talking about interaction.

***Q.** At this first stage of the selection process, you obviously feel confident that the process is fair and above board.*

Carruthers. The Academy committee is, in fact, a collection of honorable, excellent people.

***Q.** Your lobbying efforts, then, are aimed at the next stage.*

Carruthers. That committee will provide a short list. We are not lobbying that committee. We're not going near that committee. Our trouble is with whether or not this project is going to happen. And, in fact, most of our activities in Washington have to do with trying to make the thing happen. And, secondarily, we'd like to say, "By the way, here's an outstanding proposal." We ourselves are responsible people who have the integrity and skill to manage it and by our presence as a national leader, people can see it wouldn't be a stupid thing to give it to our state. In fact, we've got the best site.

***Q.** What is your expectation after the Academy committee has done its work. It will be above suspicion, don't you agree?*

Carruthers. Pretty much.

***Q.** Pretty much? Are you introducing an element of doubt?*

Carruthers. There are some subjective elements, always. I think the committee couldn't be better in its choices [of members]. There are some contentious issues having to do with how much a state can contribute in up-front cash. You know about the Domenici Amendment [sponsored by Senator Pete V. Domenici (R-NM)], which is trying to make that a non-issue [by prohibiting consideration of "financial or other incentives"—SGR June 1, 1987]. The other thing has to do with issues like the counting of the investment in Fermilab [the particle-accelerator center near Chicago]. Most of us in the early days would have said why not build it at Fermilab, because there's a functioning laboratory, it's a good place, it's all set up, and can go to work.

It turns out, though, that they have a construction situation which we're not sure makes this the best place to put the laboratory. They have to go down at least 400 feet to get into good rock, and it's under water in a lot of

(Continued on page 3)

ISSN 0048-9581

© Science & Government Report, Inc., 1987

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg

Associate Publisher
Wanda J. Reif

European Correspondent
Francois Seguier (Paris)

Independently published by *Science & Government Report, Inc.*, twice monthly, except once each in January, July, August, and September. Annual subscription: Institutions, \$225.00 (two years, \$395.00). Information about bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second-class postage at Washington, D.C. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on University Microfilms International. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six weeks of publication date.

. . . Physics "Community Is a Little Different"

(Continued from page 2)

the place. This makes the construction costs go up, but worse yet, you have to build these giant experimental halls at great depth and keep them watertight. This really hurts your flexibility in deploying additions. So, it's not clear to us that that is the best arrangement, whereas a lot of states can provide shallow tunnels, where it's easy access and cheaper construction.

Meek. I spent a lot of time personally sponsoring and helping the Domenici Amendment, as it's in the interest of all the states with the best sites to make sure that bribery is excluded from the process.

Jacob. You're trying to find out whether or not we think we're buying influence. I don't think so. I think we're buying intelligence and ability to interact in real time.

Don't Take the Low Road

Q. *Why not buy some influence?*

Jacob. That would be tawdry.

Q. *Tawdry? That's what this city is all about.*

Jacob. Maybe that's why we chose academia.

Carruthers. This community is a little different. If you get caught with your hand in the cookie jar in some way that doesn't fit the ethics of the scientific community, your colleagues will all turn their backs on you. And so, even if you have the tendency to this sort of route—. First of all, we don't believe that the low road is going to pay off for anybody. Already people in the community, that I won't name, have been uncooperative with the rest of the community.

Q. *Who's been uncooperative with the rest of the community?*

Carruthers. I said I won't name them. But most of my competitors for the SSC are my close personal friends. We talk on the phone and we share each other's doubts. We're in this as friendly competitors, because we really believe in this project. This seems strange, that there's a community ethic and bond which sticks, no matter who gets it. It's a very unusual thing, which most lobbyists don't understand. They try to talk you out of it. Most people in this town don't understand it, that there is in this tiny community a very strong bond.

Q. *What's your expectation after the BQL comes out of the Academy and a final list is sent to the White House by the Department of Energy?*

Carruthers. The first thing that will happen is that all over the country, the regional coalitions will get sorted out. Our coalition consists of 13 Western states, including Nebraska. But this is a very informal coalition. There are no signed documents with governors saying I am a member of the Western coalition. It's a loose collection of scientists who have been working on it for five years, plus a bunch of governors' science advisers. This is a way of integrating information going to all the delegations about the project in general and about the West.

Q. *The final decision is scheduled for January 1989, when a new President is inaugurated.*

Carruthers. It's clear that this Administration is trying to make the award. I've heard, and I wouldn't be surprised if the Democrats say, "Gee, if we have a chance to take over the White House, it would be nice if we could make the award."

Meek. It's very definite that the President is supposed to announce it on January 19. It's supposed to be the last thing that Reagan does before he leaves office.

Q. *Do you expect that partisan political considerations will enter into it after the short list comes out of the Academy?*

Carruthers. I wouldn't be surprised. But this has been cleaner so far than most people [expected]. We understand that the White House is determined to keep it clean.

Q. *How do you know that?*

Carruthers. I believe they understand that this project is a little different than a dam.

A Memo from Howard Baker?

Meek. Howard Baker [White House Chief of Staff] put out a memo, according to part of our team.

Q. *Have you seen the memo?*

Meek. No, I have not. But that's the sense, from the contacts made and so forth, that is—

Carruthers. It would be interesting to see that memo. Does [your staff member] have the memo?

Meek. Well, I don't know if he does or not. I haven't seen it. But that was my understanding about it. From the way they've approached this, by asking the Academies to get involved, the preliminaries and so forth, it's common sense. They've got other things to deal with that they don't have to put this on the front burner now and deal with it politically.

Q. *Once that short list comes out, do you think the politicking will take off?*

Carruthers. I expect so. It's inevitable.

Q. *What are you prepared to do to take part in that politicking?*

Carruthers. Keep representing our proposal as the best investment for the country. This is not something to save a rust belt. The rust belt does need help, but it doesn't need help with this.

(Continued on page 7)

New Senate Chairman Quells NIH Budget Doubts

A big uncertainty in biomedical politics this year was the role that Senator Lawton M. Chiles Jr. would play in his debut term as Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the National Institutes of Health. Previously uninvolved with NIH affairs, Chiles was believed to be far more concerned with education, particularly for poor and handicapped children, which is also in his Subcommittee's jurisdiction. And, as the budgeting system works these days, when something goes up, something else feels the pressure.

Education did well, but so did NIH and its clients under the third-term Florida Democrat, who was elevated to the chairmanship when the Republicans lost control of the Senate in the last election. His Subcommittee has come through with a large budget increase for NIH. In addition, the accompanying budget report expresses an interest in a long-deferred, important goal of NIH—revival of a national construction program for laboratory facilities. The Subcommittee didn't say go ahead, but it stated that "research is hampered by aging and obsolete research facilities and instrumentation." And it took a cautious first step by providing funds for the Director of NIH to study a "pilot research facilities construction program."

The outcome of Chiles' obvious good wishes for NIH remains uncertain as virtually the entire federal budget hangs in a Gramm-Rudman limbo one month into the 1988 fiscal year. But his Subcommittee did its part, voting NIH a budget of $6.8 billion, including $468 million for AIDS. In total, that's $1.2 billion above the backsliding sum that White House requested for NIH, and $685 million above last year's budget.

The House was even more generous, voting $7 billion in all. Assuming the normal routine prevails, the two chambers will split the difference. However, whether NIH can escape the impending budgetary carnage is another matter.

The subject of a renewed construction program was cautiously described in the Senate Subcommittee report as "one of the most complicated biomedical research support issues facing the Congress. The question involves a variety of subquestions," the report continued, "including how one measures the need for such assistance, what share of this need the federal government should assume, what mechanisms could best be used to channel federal aid to construction, and how funds . . . should be allocated among competing institutions."

The report added that "These questions have been further complicated by recent studies by the National Science Foundation which surveyed the research community and found a large amount of construction in the life and medical science fields currently underway—

(Continued on page 5)

Uncertainty Clouds R&D Funds

With the 1988 fiscal year one month gone, and not a single appropriations bill completed in Congress, federal agencies are operating on a continuing resolution that authorizes spending at the levels appropriated for fiscal 1987. But confusion reigns as the Gramm-Rudman doomsday machine moves toward automatic spending reductions designed to clip a total of $23 billion from estimated spending in fiscal 1988.

The continuing resolution expires on November 10. If the appropriations bills aren't freed by then, the resolution will have to be extended to keep the Treasury checks moving. Meanwhile, there's a freeze on starting up new projects, even long-planned ones. And agency officials, uncertain of what lies ahead, are even holding back on 1987 levels of spending as a safeguard against possibly whopping cuts later in the year.

The cuts could be forestalled by revenue increases or selective reductions that, together, could meet the required deficit-reduction goal. But, while negotiations continue between the White House and Congress, the Congressional Budget Office has fulfilled its duty by producing the nightmare publication of the federal establishment, *Initial Sequestration Report for Fiscal Year 1988,* a compendium of agency-by-agency spending reductions to be implemented if—. "Sequestration," the 56-page CBO report states, "involves the permanent cancellation of new budget authority and other authority to obligate and expend funds . . . "

The reductions total $11.5 billion each for military and non-military programs. But the Pentagon's cuts are calculated on the basis of 10.4 percent of projected 1988 spending, while civilian reductions are based on 8.7 percent.

In the category of General Science, Space, and Technology—mainly NSF, NASA, and DOE basic science—a total of $600 million would be taken from outlays originally projected at $11 billion; budget authority—the right to commit but not necessarily spend in 1988—would be reduced to $12 billion, a reduction of $1.1 billion. For NSF, the reduction in outlays would total $63 million, and budget authority would decline by $127 million. NIH's share would include, for example, a reduction of $62 million in outlays by the National Cancer Institute—the largest component in the NIH—and a cut in NCI budget authority of $124 million.

The budget system has turned into a managerial quagmire, difficult for all who work in it, especially those facing the long lead times common to research and development programs.

. . . Pressure Again to Assist Industrial Biotechnology

(Continued from page 4)
mostly financed from non-federal sources." [The studies are summarized in an NSF report, *Infrastructure: The Capital Requirements for Academic Research*—see SGR July 1, 1987.]

To get an NIH perspective on the issue, the Subcommittee reported that it has given the Director of NIH funds to convene a small group of consultants "to recommend the design, program balance, and administration of an initial pilot research facilities construction program at NIH. This group shall also address the question of the total requirements for such a program; the appropriate mix of federal and non-federal funding; and the appropriate mix of non-federal funding sources." The report stated that the Subcommittee "expects" the NIH Director "to be prepared to discuss this problem including the role of indirect cost mechanisms and the role non-federal governments and organizations should play in addressing this problem" at next year's budget hearings.

A suggestion of construction money to come is contained in a passage concerning the National Cancer Institute's program of Cancer Centers and Community Clinical Oncology. Although funds for construction have not been provided, pending the study that has been ordered, the report states, "it is intended that the NCI construction program staff be kept intact, so that current existing staff expertise should not be lost, in the event that the Congress determines next year that the program should be continued and funded."

Contained in an appropriations report, rather than in a bill, the statements of expectations and intentions have the standing of merely a word to the wise, rather than the weight of law. But given the central role that appropriations subcommittees occupy in the financial life of federal agencies, "appropriations language" usually receives careful attention. Other such items in the Senate report included:

- A directive for the head of NIH to recommend, no later than February 1, "a program to encourage cooperative university-industry applied biotechnology research." The Subcommittee expressed reverence for NIH's role in basic research, and said it should continue, but it noted that other nations are stressing commercial developments in biotechnology and it suggested that NIH could help match their efforts. In its section on the National Institute of General Medical Sciences, the Subcommittee stated that it is "not satisified with the efforts of NIGMS and NIH generally to encourage and assist the private sector in commercializing the many advances and discoveries made as a result of the intramural and extramural basic research funded by NIH."

This is old stuff for the NIH management, which shrugged off similar efforts by George A. Keyworth II when he was White House science adviser. The motto for the resistance was provided by Theodore Cooper, a former NIH Heart Institute Director, now in industry: "Let NIH be NIH." The Subcommittee apparently intends another round on that issue, and set next January 15 for delivery of a report on "what additional NIH programs or activities are needed to help ensure that the findings of NIH basic research are commercialized by US firms."

- On the controversial issue of cancer survival statistics, which NCI has often been accused of inflating to enhance the image of its programs, the Subcommittee "requests" NCI to convene a panel of outsiders to recommend what "measures are most appropriate to assess progress in cancer." Submission date for the panel report was set for next June.
- In harmony with the report last July by its faster-moving House Appropriations counterpart, the Senate Subcommittee endorsed establishment of a National Center for Biotechnology Information at the Library of Medicine. The Senate report provides $5 million for this purpose, while the House version calls for $3 million.

NSF Gives Pentagon a Hand

Working for the Defense Department, with DOD money, the National Science Foundation has awarded $3 million to the Semiconductor Research Corporation to perform analysis and planning for a Pentagon-backed industrial consortium for R&D in semiconductor manufacturing. The consortium, SEMATECH, has been conceived as a counter to Japan's dominance in the semiconductor field.

The role as a financial pass-through is not unprecedented for NSF, but it is unusual enough for the Foundation to issue a press release stating that the arrangement had been approved by the National Science Board, NSF's policymaking body. It also stated that "DOD requested NSF assistance because the agency's experience in responding quickly to special funding requirements would help expedite the project and because NSF is lead federal agency for a cooperative multi-agency project involving support of basic research on semiconductors at universities."

The nuggets in that windy statement are, first, that the elephantine Pentagon is notoriously slow in dishing out funds—particularly minor sums, like $3 million; second, that the university-supporting NSF is sensitive about getting involved with the Pentagon, whose security zealots regard academe's open doors as a threat to national safety.

In Print: Data Security, Fusion, NIH Awards, Etc.

Defending Secrets, Sharing Data: New Locks and Keys for Electronic Information (GPO Stock No. 052-003-01083-6; 185 pp., $8.50), report by the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment, notes that hackers and eavesdroppers can easily penetrate many systems designed in more innocent times, and raises as a major policy issue the relative roles of civilian and national-security agencies in formulating protective policies and practices. This is the second segment of OTA's continuing study of communications technologies; the first, ***The Electronic Supervisor: New Technologies, New Tensions,*** (GPO Stock No. 052-003-01082-8; $6.50) was published in September.

Starpower: The US and the International Quest for Fusion Energy (GPO Stock No. 052-003-01079-8; 236 pp., $10), also from OTA, concludes that a prototype commercial fusion reactor is at least 30 years away, that US government spending is insufficient for the necessary prior step of demonstrating technological feasibility early in the next century, and that a strong domestic program, in conjunction with expanded international collaboration, is the way to go. Written under the supervision of an 18-member advisory panel chaired by William Carey, retired Executive Officer of the AAAS, the OTA report cautions against "crash development of fusion power." It adds, "There is little to be gained—and a great deal to be lost—by introducing fusion before its potential economic, environmental, and safety capabilities are attained."

OTA publications are available from the Superintendent of Documents, USGPO, Washington, DC 20402-9325; tel. 202/783-3238.

•

Money to Burn? The High Costs of Energy Subsidies (68 pp.), report from the World Resources Institute, by Mark Kosmo, a Research Associate in the WRI economics program, reviews energy-pricing practices in 32 nations, and concludes that subsidies encourage depletion of resources, favor the rich, and are environmentally unsound.

Available for $10 per copy, plus $2 postage, from WRI Publications, PO Box 420, Holmes, Pa. 19043.

•

Health Resources in the Federal Government (fourth edition, 36 pp.), lists over 100 health- and research-related offices and agencies, most in the Department of Health and Human Services, briefly describes their activities, publications, and data services, and provides addresses and telephone numbers.

Available without charge from Health Information Resources, ODPHP National Health Information Center, ONHIC, PO Box 1133, Washington, DC 20013-1133; tel. 800/336-4797 or 301/565-4167.

From **US Oil Production: The Effect of Low Prices** *(132 pages), a report by the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment.*

•

The continuing development of new and improved technologies, especially focused on cutting costs, will be a crucial determinant of the future success of the [US] industry in reducing the decline in oil reserves and production rates expected to accompany lower oil prices. Although the level of effort in oilfield R&D is difficult to track because it is hidden in so many different accounting "cubbyholes," most industry observers feel that it has been cut back substantially. For example, the former president of Exxon Research and Engineering Co. [Edward E. David Jr., as quoted in *Science,* June 27, 1986] has estimated that research, development, and engineering within the industry has been cut by at least 30 to 40 percent in the last three years.

If the observers are correct, and if the industry wishes to be able to prevent large production drops, the industry is probably doing the opposite of what it should be doing, despite its need to economize in response to drastic cuts in revenues. In the face of drastic changes in their economic environments, other industries have achieved large cuts in production costs . . . .

According to the French Petroleum Institute (IFP), potential near-term improvements in oilfield technology can offer very substantial cost savings . . . . The majority of industry reviewers of the draft version of this report were quite skeptical of the IFP estimates . . . There were, however, a minority of "technology optimists," some of whom are familiar with current research and development programs, who are hopeful about the potential for achieving cost savings . . . These hopes are, of course, dependent on the industry somehow resisting the current trends toward reduced R&D expenditures and focusing a substantial effort on cost-saving technology.

US Oil Production (Stock No. 052-003-01075-5) is available for $6.50 from Superintendent of Documents, USGPO, Washington, DC 20402; tel. 202/783-3238.

An Evaluation of the NIH Research Career Development Award (102 pp.), by a RAND Corp. research group, under contract to NIH, looks at NIH's program for providing stable, long-term salary support (up to $40,000 annually) for selected researchers and concludes that "the program has not consistently awarded

(Continued on page 7)

SSC: Even If We Lose, State Will Gain from Effort

(Continued from page 3)

***Q.** [To Meek] John, do you have any tricks up your sleeve to help get the SSC for Arizona?*

Meek. I'd rather be lucky than good. I think that we have a good product in a sense that it sells itself, if you can present it and get people interested. In the time right now, some of the people we would like to talk to, like the *Washington Post* and the *New York Times,* specifically about Arizona, are not interested. The *Wall Street Journal* was just here, but to the best of my knowledge, they didn't even file a story on the proposal filing. But when the BQL comes out, it's going to be a different ball game. So, what we're trying to do is to get people acquainted with these guys, because they are the front people, and they're going to be the front people next year on the BQL.

***Q.** What if they're not on the BQL? It's entirely possible.*

Meek. It is entirely possible. But if they aren't, that's the end of it.

***Q.** In that case, the game's over for Arizona?*

Whole Region Could Benefit

Meek. The game is over, in a sense, depending. We have been very explicit about this. This $4.5 billion is not going to be spent in Arizona. The magnets and so forth are going to be spread around. In New Mexico, they're neighbors, and even Colorado. If it's a regional thing, all that region is going to benefit. So, what we're trying to do PR-wise is, we said from the start in our proposal, that we would hope that almost everything that we could do would accrue to the long-range benefit of Arizona, regardless of what happened to the SSC. So, Arizona can use good PR all the time.

Jacobs. We're convinced that the money that the state has spent on this so far will come back whether we're on the short list or not.

Carruthers. People from all parts of the state—engineering societies have donated a lot of free time and expertise. The lust for this project has pulled people together that never would have thought of cooperating. Not only in Arizona. You see Mississippi finally facing up to its inferior educational system and other infrastructure—. It's clear to me from reading the press clippings that no matter what happens to their Super Collider project, they're going to fix up their state educational system. So, this project has had a terrific effect all over the country.

Job Shifts and Appointments

Thomas P. Rona, a Pentagon space and intelligence analyst who's been on detail to the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy since last December, has been promoted to Associate Director of OSTP. Rona joined the Pentagon in 1984 after 25 years with the Boeing Co. He told a Senate confirmation hearing October 15 that he will retain his current OSTP responsibility for government science and technology programs and would, in addition, assume responsibility "for international science and technology issues and those of direct concern to the academic and privately supported communities." The OSTP legislative charter allows for four associate directors—a level just below director. The other three posts have not been filled.

Robert M. Rosenzweig has been appointed to a second five-year term as President of the Association of American Universities, the Washington-based lobby for big academic research. Elected as AAU Chairman: ***Harold T. Shapiro,*** President of the University of Michigan, succeeding ***Steven Muller,*** President of Johns Hopkins.

Reappointed for second one-year terms as Chairman and Vice Chairman, respectively, of the NSF Advisory Committee to the Directorate for Science and Engineering Education· ***Gerald Holton,*** Harvard, and ***Margaret MacVicar,*** MIT. The 30-member Committee, selected by the head of the Directorate, ***Bassam Z. Shakhashiri,*** has long thundered about NSF's tendency to neglect education in favor of research support.

In Print *(Continued from page 6)*

grants to superior researchers in the intended career stage—that is, researchers with limited experience but outstanding promise to become productive investigators." Instead, RAND reports, established investigators have received many of the awards, of which 3800, for a total of $400 million, have been awarded over the past 25 years.

The report, RAND/R-3568-NIH, is available for $10 from RAND Corp., 2100 M St. NW, Washington, DC 20037; tel. 202/296-5000.

To Order or Renew

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station, Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription; ☐ Check enclosed
☐ Enter my subscription; ☐ Please bill
Institutional subscribers: one year, $225.00 ☐;
two years, $395.00 ☐

(Overseas airmail, $30.00 per year additional.)

Name _____

Address _____

_____ Zip _____

Toll-Free Subscription Service: 1-800-522-1970;
In Wash., D.C.: 785-5054

New Organization Proposed for Agricultural Research

The following is from a talk by Rep. George Brown (D-Calif.), Chairman of the House Agriculture Subcommittee on Department Operations, Research, and Foreign Agriculture, to the Industrial Biotechnology Association, October 23, in Washington.

•

[In addition to projected shortages of agricultural researchers], we face serious facilities and equipment needs, the result of years of neglect in agricultural research funding. What scarce facilities and equipment funds exist in agricultural programs are increasingly becoming political footballs, directed at an individual state or congressional district based upon narrow political considerations . . . .

First, we need to assemble a sufficient core of competitively awarded, peer-reviewed federal agricultural research funding which can tap the research investments made by other federal agencies and which can use the facilities, equipment, and people which exist in industry and academic institutions. We must be prepared to sacrifice some of the funds dedicated to special projects and politically earmarked programs in order to create this "magnet" designed to draw other resources into agriculture. I would suggest that at least $100 million would be needed initially and it should be set aside in a stand-alone institution within USDA (US Department of Agriculture).

I suggest that this entity take on an organization similar to an institute at the National Institutes of Health and become the focus for applied and basic research directed at solving critical agricultural biotechnology research problems. It should also become the home for the various fellowship and graduate assistantship programs designed to develop new talent and draw more people into the agricultural research loop . . . .

This entity should also enjoy the support of other vital existing functions. The National Plant Germplasm System will be taxed by the plant and animal germplasm needs which will result from the new biotechnologies. This system is underfunded and diffused throughout the agricultural research system. It needs to be pulled together . . . The same situation exists with the National Agricultural Library, which should be given a mandate and direction to put it on the level of the National Library of Medicine . . . .

My hope is that a new structure will provide a catalyst for creative discussion and perhaps an organizing tool as attractive to agricultural researchers as a super-collider or a space station or a Hubble [orbiting] Telescope has been for other disciplines.

I would expect that a majority of the funding from such an institute would go to the traditional agricultural research facilities, providing them with leverage over state and industry funding . . . . It would be useful for this effort to reach out to other sources or talent, even overseas. The President of Clemson University, Dr. Max Lennon, [has] proposed a US-Japan fellowship program to tap talent which exists in that country and to train our researchers to "think globally." This same idea was raised by Dr. Ron Cape, of Cetus Corp., in his recent proposal for a program of "harmony fellowships." If we are going to be short of people in coming years, and if there is talent elsewhere in the world, we should find a tool for bringing this talent to bear on our problems while building bridges to potential foreign markets and, yes, even foreign sources of research funding . . . .

I hope to begin exploration of these ideas in a series of hearings on agricultural research in the House Agriculture Subcommittee which I chair. I hope to conduct these hearings over the next few months . . . .

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C.

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS INC.
SERIALS ACQUISITIONS
300 N. ZEEB RD.
ANN ARBOR, MI 48106